

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending and under consideration and claims 7-14 stand withdrawn pursuant to an election of claims.

In the Final Office Action of April 5, 2007, claims 1-6 were rejected as obvious in view of Sekiguchi (USP 6771327) and Nielson (USP 6331840).

In response, without conceding the rejection, claim 1 has been amended without adding new matter and the basis for the rejection is again traversed.

First, the purported disclosure of Nielsen as outlined in the rejection is simply wrong. In the office action two portions of text taken out of context have been referred in order to establish a an alleged disclosure that simply does not exist.

At column 1, lines 34-37, Nielsen notes that when one has two different personal digital assistants (PDAs), there necessarily is a discontinuous surface whose touch input cannot be maintained over the discontinuity because each PDA has a separate touch screen, i.e., there is more than one touch screen involved.

At column 1, lines 58-62, Nielsen explains that in accordance with the disclosed invention, it is possible to maintain continuity of input over different touch screens using the pointing device because the pointing device itself crosses the discontinuity. As noted in the response of December 26, 2006, this is accomplished through a software mapping technique.

There is no fair suggestion or disclosure in these two remarks to build a device having a single substrate upon which a plurality of display devices are formed and over which a continuous touch screen panel is secured. The Office Action inappropriately fashions this alleged disclosure without any basis for doing so.

The office action also refers to instrument control display panels for vehicular dashboards as allegedly having a single substrate upon which a plurality of display devices are formed. The examiner is requested to provide an example of such or withdraw the rejection. In any event, the claimed combination is not fairly suggested or taught by any such dashboard panels as there is no fair suggestion to combine same with the other cited art. Any such alleged combination is the result of impermissible hindsight and/or conjecture.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite the inclusion of a flexible touch panel made up of plastic films. This is supported throughout the specification at too many places to list herein. However, one such reference is provided at page 13, second full paragraph.

There clearly is no fair disclosure or suggestion in the cited prior art, and purported dashboard panels, or any combination of them to provide the claimed device having all of the recited features of:

1. a single substrate;
2. multiple display devices formed on the single substrate;
3. a continuous flexible touch sensitive panel secured over the entire substrate and its multiple display devices.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 1-6 are patentable over the cited art and that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/David R. Metzger/, Reg. 32,919
David R. Metzger
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Customer ID No. 26263
Attorneys for Applicant